

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DONNA JONES,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No. 1:10-cv-202-MEF
v.)	
)	
FRED HAMIC, <i>et al.</i> ,)	(WO)
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

This cause is before the Court on the Plaintiff’s Objections to the Court’s Uniform Scheduling Order. (Doc. # 79). The Court recognizes that in the Report of Parties’ Rule 26 Planning Meeting (“the report”), the parties could not agree on a date for the close of discovery. Such a dispute regarding deadlines is one ordinarily resolved by the district court, and not referred to the magistrate. In the parties’ report, the Plaintiff proposed that discovery be completed 30 days after the dispositive motion deadline. (Doc. # 72). The Defendants proposed that discovery be completed 30 days prior to the dispositive motion deadline. *Id.* In selecting a deadline for the close of discovery, the Court split the difference and ordered that the close of discovery will coincide with the dispositive motion deadline. The Court views this as a fair resolution of the parties’ dispute, and accordingly, the Plaintiff’s objection is OVERRULED.

Done this the 1st day of July, 2011.

/s/ Mark E. Fuller
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE